

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
CENTRAL DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**CASE NO. 4:19-CR-00156-BSM**

**CHRIS MICHAEL GUIDRY**

**DEFENDANT**

**ORDER**

Chris Guidry's pro se motions to vacate his conviction [Doc. No. 107] and for injunctive relief [Doc. No. 108] are denied for the same reasons that his previous post-judgment motions have been denied. *See* Doc. Nos. 77, 80, 87, 99 & 105. Additionally, Guidry's request for independent review is denied because I am not biased against him and my presiding over these motions is not a violation of his right to due process. *See Nelson v. United States*, 297 F. App'x 563, 566–67 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam). Moreover, Guidry's request for injunctive relief is denied because he has not made a clear showing that he is entitled to such an extraordinary remedy. *See Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008); *see also United States v. Waite, Inc.*, 480 F. Supp. 1235, 1239–40 (W.D. Pa. 1979) (federal tax lien not released until certificate of release issued).

There is no need to conduct an evidentiary hearing because the record conclusively shows that Guidry is not entitled to relief. *See Lipscomb v. United States*, 755 F.2d 689, 691 (8th Cir. 1985). Furthermore, no certificate of appealability is issued because Guidry has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of March, 2025.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE